

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 7 and 13 have been amended. Claims 1-6, 8 and 15-19 have been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 7 and 9-14 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 15, 18 and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by “Wisnock Direct: The Value of System Area Networks” by Jim Pinkerton (*Pinkerton*). Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 15, 18 and 19 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 15, 18 and 19 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 9-12 are not anticipated by *Pinkerton*.

Claim 7 recites:

encoding a software module to reserve memory space that allows a network software memory program to bypass a central processing unit to access the memory space when just-in-time (JIT) application code is received in a managed runtime environment (MRTE), the network software memory program operating according to a remote direct memory access protocol.

Thus, Applicants claim bypassing a central processing unit for JIT application code.

Pinkerton does not appear to address JIT application code. Therefore, *Pinkerton* cannot anticipate claim 7. Claims 9-12 depend from claim 7. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, claims 9-12 are not anticipated by *Pinkerton* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 13, 14, 16 and 17 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Pinkerton* in view of the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Fifth Edition (*Microsoft*). Claims 3, 16 and 17 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3, 16 and 17 is moot. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 13 and 14 are not rendered obvious by *Pinkerton* and *Microsoft*.

Microsoft is cited to teach garbage collection. Assuming, for purposes of argument only, that the combination of *Pinkerton* and *Microsoft* is proper, *Microsoft* does not cure the deficiencies of *Pinkerton*. Therefore, no combination of *Pinkerton* and *Microsoft* can teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 13 and 14.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 7-14 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: February 26, 2007

/Paul A. Mendonsa/
Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778